

18. (New) The method of claim 7 wherein the administration step is repeated at least once.

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed October 7, 2003. Applicants have amended claim 9 and added new claim 18 in response to the Examiner's objection to the form of claim 9. Applicants are further submitting new replacement drawings in response to the objections raised in the cited Office Action. In response to the restriction requirement raised by the Examiner in the October 7, 2003 Office Action, Applicants provisionally elect with traverse Group I, claim(s) 1-8, 10-17, drawn to a method for transfer of genetic material to cells in culture using an ovine adenoviral vector, with the additional request that the Examiner add claim 9 as amended and new claim 18 to Group I. However, based on the remarks below, Applicants feel that a restriction requirement would be inappropriately applied in the prosecution of this application, and respectfully requests that the Examiner remove the restriction requirement and proceed with the prosecution of all pending amended and new claims on their merits.

Objections to the Claims

Claim 9 was objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim may not depend from a multiple dependent claim. Applicants have amended claim 9 herein to no longer depend from multiple dependent claim 8, and the objection should now be removed.

Restriction Requirement

In order for a restriction requirement to be appropriate, there must be a serious burden on the Examiner to search all of the inventions.

While the Applicants do not feel that a restriction requirement is appropriately applied to any of the claims now pending in the Application as not being unduly burdensome, Applicants argue that no more than two groups should be identified, with a first group directed to the production of recombinant cells in culture, and a second group directed to transferring genetic material into mammals, instead of the ten groups which the Examiner set forth in the above-referenced Office Action. Indeed, the Examiner has consistently linked Groups I-V and VI-X throughout the discussion. Such a grouping should not impose a serious search burden on the Examiner.

Objections to the Drawings

The drawings were objected to on the basis that the views in the Figures were not labeled properly and the quality of the Figures was poor. Applicants file herewith in response replacement drawings for Figures 1-3 that Applicants believe to be in full compliance with the draftpersons's requests.

The foregoing is submitted as a full and complete response to the Office Action mailed October 7, 2003. No additional fees are believed to be due, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees due or credit any overpayment to deposit account no. 19-5029.

If there are any issues that can be resolved by a telephone conference or an Examiner's amendment, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (404) 853-8522.

Respectfully submitted,



Ralph E. Gaskins, Jr., MD
Reg. No. 50,136

SUTHERLAND ASBILL & BRENNAN LLP
999 Peachtree Street, NE
Atlanta, Georgia 30309-3996
Tel. No. (404) 853-8000
Fax No. (404) 853-8806

SAB Docket No.: 18744-0005